

REMARKS

In the Office Action, a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. 121 was issued, which required an election between two groups of claims, in particular between Species I of Figure 4, and Species II of Figure 5. Applicant hereby elects, with traverse, the Species I claims 1 and 3-20 for prosecution and has withdrawn the Species II claim 2.

Applicant understands that the restriction of species between the claims of Species I and the claim of Species II is for the purpose of facilitating the Examiner's search. Thus, if a generic claim 1 is allowed, then any dependent claim that is consistent with the generic claim 1 will also be allowed. Applicant reviewed the species groupings and determined that the claims of each grouping are properly classified as follows:

Group I: claims 1 and 3-20

Group II: claim 2

The applicant respectfully asserts that the subject matter recited in claim 1 is generic, and thus that dependent claim 2 should not be subject to restriction. In particular, claim 1 recites a method of providing a regular outline in a useful layer of material that is transferred from a source substrate onto a support substrate during the fabrication of a composite substrate. The method includes providing a shoulder on a front face of one of the source or support substrates about its periphery. The shoulder defines an inner projecting zone that has a top face, a sidewall and a regular outline. Next, the technique includes molecularly bonding the top face of the projecting zone to a receiving face of the other of the source or support substrates. Finally, a portion of the source substrate is removed to provide the useful layer having the regular outline on the support substrate. Claim 2 merely recites that the shoulder is provided on the support substrate, and that the top face of the projecting zone is molecularly bonded to the receiving face of the source substrate. The applicant respectfully asserts that searching with regard to the method and structure for this feature would not result in an undue burden on the Examiner, and would necessarily be required in order to properly evaluate the patentability for either claim Group. For this reason, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn and all claims examined at this time.

Furthermore, the applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance. The issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/10/04


Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

WINSTON & STRAWN
CUSTOMER NO. 28765
(212) 294-3311

NY:922387.1